

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Initially, Applicant notes the Office Action Summary portion of the Office Action indicates that the specification of the application is objected to. The Detailed Action portion of the Office Action, however, does not indicate any reason for objecting to the specification. Therefore, Applicant believes the indication in the Office Action Summary of an objection to the specification is merely a typographical error, and, accordingly, there is no outstanding objection to the specification.

Claims 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, and 32-34 are now pending, with claims 20, 24, and 28 being independent claims. Claims 32-34 have been added. Claims 20, 24, and 28 have been amended. Support for the new claims and amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure, including, for example, at page 33, line 2 through page 34, line 18 of the specification. Thus, Applicant submits the new claims and amendments include no new matter.

Claims 20, 24, and 28 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,650) in view of Hino (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0036788) and Yudasaka (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0202211). Claims 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedar et al. in view of Hino and Yudasaka, and further in view of Hertzfeld (U.S. Patent No. 6,441,824).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and solely to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claims 20, 24, and 28, to further clarify features of the invention not taught or suggested by the cited references. To this end, Applicant submits the claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 20 recites a document printing system comprising, inter alia, a selection unit for (i) selecting a specified typeface if the font size is larger than or equal to a first size, (ii) selecting a typeface with thin weight in the specified font if the font size is smaller than the first size and is larger than or equal to a second size, and (iii) selecting a certain font regardless of the specified font if the font size is smaller than the second size. Amend independent 24 recites a document printing method comprising an selection step analogous to the function of the selection unit of claim 20, and amended independent claim 28 recites a computer-readable medium with a computer program that executes a method comprising an selection step analogous to the function of the selection unit of claim 20.

Applicant submits the primary citation in the Office Action to Cedar et al. does not disclose or suggest a selection unit or selection step as recited in amended independent claims 20, 24, and 28. Cedar et al. is asserted in the rejection to disclose a document printing system with some of the features of the claimed invention. Cedar et al., however, does not include selection of a typeface based on a selected font size, as recited in independent claims 20, 24, and 28. Nor does Cedar et al. disclose selecting a certain typeface regardless of a specified font if a font size is smaller than a certain size, as also recited in independent claims 20, 24, and 28.

Applicant further submits that none of the secondary citations cure the deficiency of Cedar et al., Hino and Yudasaka et al., like Cedar et al., do not include selection of a typeface based on a selected font size. Hertzfeld discloses, inter alia, font size and/or font style to find a combination that allows information to fit within an available display area. See, e.g., Hertzfeld, col. 4, lines 43-47. Hertzfeld does not disclose, however, selecting a typeface based on a selected font size, or selecting a certain typeface regardless of a specified font if a font size is smaller than a certain size, as recited in independent claims 20, 24, and 28.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits the cited references, whether taken individually or collectively, do not disclose or suggest the invention recited in independent Claims 20, 24, and 28.

The dependent are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to the independent claims. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claims recite additional features further distinguishing them from the applied references. Thus, favorable and independent consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are allowable over the references of record, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the application are earnestly solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DHH/trl

FCIS_WS 2523546v1